

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 31, 2001

LB 215

have a copy of this on your desk too, Creighton officials said the university is now among 12 Jesuit campuses that recognize an organization for gay and lesbian students. Then, over to the second column, toward the bottom, the Chris...this is from President Schlegel's letter. Schlegel quotes portions of a statement from the U.S. Catholic Bishops Committee on Marriage and Family that he said guided Creighton's decision to support the student group. Quote: The Christian community should offer its homosexual sisters and brothers understanding and pastoral care. Nothing in the Bible or in Catholic teaching can be used to justify prejudicial or discriminatory attitudes and behaviors. This provision in LB 215 deals with the matter of prejudicial behaviors and attitudes from which those behaviors spring. It is not supporting any kind of lifestyle. It simply says anybody has the right to be shown property and the right to purchase it. This is a right which all of our citizens should have and I think the fact that a Roman Catholic university could recognize a student group which addresses the problems of gay and lesbian students should let you know that this kind of discrimination is not appropriate. Therefore, I'm asking you that we override the Governor's veto. In addition to what I've said, there are extremely important elements in the bill that the Real Estate Commission, the Board of Realtors need. They have tried to make it clear to everybody how important the bill is. This amendment is a very small aspect of a very important bill. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Chambers. The speaking order on the motion to override LB 215 is Senator Smith, followed by Senators Landis, Beutler, Schimek, Tyson, Kruse, and Wickersham. Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President. Members, I don't want to take up a lot of time here today and I don't want to repeat a bunch of items that I mentioned earlier today, but I do want to add emphasis and that is...and that is emphasis to the fact that it is not the intent to turn anyone away with housing and that...and that is not even the outcome of this bill in its current form should the override take place. And it's unclear language that I think opens a door for unnecessary litigation in several situations. And I realize that there's an intent of the